arXiv:1604.08289v1 [quant-ph] 28 Apr 2016

CONSTRUCTION OF QUANTUM STATES WITH SPECIAL PROPERTIES BY PROJECTION METHODS

XUEFENG DUAN, CHI-KWONG LI, DIANE PELEJO

Abstract. We use projection methods to construct (global) quantum states with prescribed reduced (marginal) states, and possibly with some special properties such as having specific eigenvalues, having specific rank and extreme von Neumann or Rényi entropy. Using convex analysis, optimization techniques on matrix manifolds, we obtain algorithms to solve the problem. Matlab programs are written based on these algorithms and numerical examples are illustrated. The numerical results reveal new patterns leading to new insights and research problems on the topic.

Keywords: Quantum states, reduced (marginal) states, tensor product, positive semidefinite matrices, density matrices, projections.

AMS Classification: 15B57, 15B18, 46N10, 81P45.

1. Introduction

In quantum information science, quantum states are used to store, process, and transmit information. Mathematically, quantum states are represented by density matrices, i.e., positive semidefinite matrices of trace 1; for example see [1, 2]. Thus, many problems in quantum information science can be reduced to the study of density matrices and transformations on density matrices with special properties.

Let M_n (H_n) be the set of $n \times n$ complex (Hermitian) matrices, and let D_n be the set of density matrices in M_n. Given quantum systems with states $\rho_j \in D_{n_j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$, their product state is given by

$$\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_k \in D_{n_1 \cdots n_k} \tag{1}$$

A general state in the multipartite system is a density matrix $\rho \in D_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$.

Note that tensor products like that of equation (1) form a spanning set for $H_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ over the real field and for $M_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ over the complex field. For any subset $J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_r\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let $J^c = \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus J$. One can define a (unique) linear map $\mathrm{tr}_{J^c} : M_{n_1 \cdots n_k} \longrightarrow M_{n_{j_1} \cdots n_{j_r}}$, known as the partial trace map with respect to J, as follows

$$\mathrm{tr}_{J^c}(\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_k) = \rho_{j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{j_r} \qquad \forall\ \rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_k \in D_{n_1, \ldots, n_k} \tag{2}$$

If ρ is the state of a multipartite system, then $\mathrm{tr}_{J^c}(\rho) = \rho_J$ is called the reduced state of the subsystem indexed by J.

For example, if $k = 2$, we have a bipartite system. There are two partial traces of the form

$$\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \mapsto \rho_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \mapsto \rho_2$$

for any product states $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$. Clearly, the two maps correspond to the case when $J^c = \{2\}$ and $J^c = \{1\}$, respectively. We will use the notation tr_2 and tr_1 for the two maps for notation

simplicity. For a general state $\rho = (\rho_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n_1} \in D_{n_1\cdot n_2}$ such that $\rho_{ij} \in M_{n_2}$, we have

$$\operatorname{tr}_1(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \rho_{jj} \in M_{n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{tr}_2(\rho) = (\operatorname{tr}\rho_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n_1} \in M_{n_1}.$$

If $k = 3$, we have a tripartite system, and there are six partial traces such that

$$\operatorname{tr}_1(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_2\otimes\rho_3, \quad \operatorname{tr}_2(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_1\otimes\rho_3, \quad \operatorname{tr}_3(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_1\otimes\rho_2,$$

$$\operatorname{tr}_{12}(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_3, \qquad \operatorname{tr}_{23}(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_1, \qquad \operatorname{tr}_{13}(\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\rho_3) = \rho_2.$$

In this paper, we study the following:

Problem 1.1 *Construct a global state $\rho \in D_{n_1\cdots n_k}$ with certain prescribed reduced (marginal) states $\rho_{J_1},\dots,\rho_{J_m}$ with special properties such as having prescribed eigenvalues, prescribed rank, extreme von Neumann entropy, or extreme Rényi entropy.*

For a bipartite system, if $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}$ and $\rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$, then $\rho = \rho_1\otimes\rho_2 \in M_{n_1n_2}$ is a global state having reduced states ρ_1 and ρ_2. However, it is not easy to construct a global state with prescribed eigenvalues. Researchers have used advanced techniques in representation theory (see [3, 4] and their references) to study the eigenvalues of the global state and the reduced states. The results are described in terms of numerous linear inequalities even for a moderate size problem (see [4]). Moreover, even if one knows that a global state with prescribed eigenvalues exists, it is not possible to construct the density matrix based on the proof. It is not easy to use these results to answer basic problems, test conjectures, or find general patterns of global states with prescribed properties. For multipartite system with more than two subsystems, the problem is more challenging. Not much results are available. For example, for a tripartite system, determining whether there is a state $\rho \in D_{n_1n_2n_3}$ with given reduced states $\rho_{12} \in D_{n_1n_2}$ and $\rho_{23} \in D_{n_2n_3}$ is an open problem.

In this paper, we will use projection methods to study Problem 1.1. Matlab programs are written based on these algorithms and numerical examples are illustrated. The numerical results reveal new patterns leading to new insights and research problems on the topic. In Section 2, we will focus on the bipartite systems. Using convex analysis and optimization techniques on matrix manifolds, we obtain algorithms based on projection methods to solve Problem 1.1. In Section 3, we extended the results to multipartite systems with more than two subsystems. Proofs can be found in Appendices A and B.

2. Bipartite States

In this section, we focus on bipartite states with prescribed reduced states $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}$ and $\rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$. In particular, we consider the set

$$\mathcal{S}(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \{\rho \in D_{n_1\cdot n_2} : \operatorname{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_2, \operatorname{tr}_2(\rho) = \rho_1\}. \tag{3}$$

Evidently, the set $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1,\rho_2)$ is *compact, convex, and non-empty* containing $\rho_1\otimes\rho_2$. Note that

$$\mathcal{S}(\rho_1\oplus 0_s, \rho_2\oplus 0_t) = \big\{[\rho_{ij}\oplus 0_t]\oplus 0_{s(n_2+t)} : [\rho_{ij}] \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}(U\rho_1U^*, V\rho_2V^*) = \{(U\otimes V)\rho(U\otimes V)^* : \rho\in\mathcal{S}(\rho_1,\rho_2)\} = (U\otimes V)\mathcal{S}(\rho_1,\rho_2)(U\otimes V)^*$$

for any unitary $U \in M_{n_1}$ and $V \in M_{n_2}$. Note also that if $T : M_{n_1 n_2} \longrightarrow M_{n_1 n_2}$ is the linear map satisfying $T(X_1 \otimes X_2) = X_2 \otimes X_1$, then

$$\mathcal{S}(\rho_2, \rho_1) = \{T(\rho) : \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)\}$$

Hence, we may often focus on the case when $n_1 \leq n_2$ and $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}, \rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$ are positive definite and are in diagonal form.

2.1. **States in $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with prescribed eigenvalues.** In this subsection, we will consider the problem of finding $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ having a prescribed set of eigenvalues $(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2})$. In general, it is difficult to give the theoretical answer to this problem; see for example [4, 5, 6]. As mentioned in the introduction, even if we know that such a ρ exists, it is difficult to construct the density matrix based on the theoretical proof. We will use projection methods to solve the problem as follows. Let $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}$ and $\rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$ be density matrices and $c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{n_1 n_2}$. Define the sets Ω_1 and Ω_2 as follows

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{\rho = (\rho_{ij}) \in M_{n_1}(M_{n_2}) : \sum \rho_{ii} = \rho_2, \quad (\operatorname{tr} \rho_{ij}) = \rho_1\right\} \tag{4}$$

$$\Omega_2 = \{W \operatorname{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2}) W^* : W \in M_{n_1 n_2} \text{ is unitary}\}. \tag{5}$$

We consider the two projection operators $\Phi_{\Omega_1} : H_{n_1 n_2} \longrightarrow \Omega_1$ and $\Phi_{\Omega_2} : H_{n_1 n_2} \longrightarrow \Omega_2$. That is,

$$||P - \Phi_{\Omega_1}(P)|| = \min_{Z \in \Omega_1} ||P - Z|| \quad \text{and} \quad ||P - \Phi_{\Omega_2}(P)|| = \min_{Z \in \Omega_2} ||P - Z||$$

We can determine Φ_{Ω_2} using the following result; for example, see [7, Theorem 10.B.10].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a unitary similarity invariant norm, i.e., $\|X\| = \|W^* X W\|$ for any $X \in H_N$ and unitary $W \in M_N$. Suppose $P = UDU^* \in H_N$, where $U \in M_N$ is unitary and D is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries arranged in descending order. Then,*

$$\|P - U \operatorname{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2}) U^*\| \leq \|P - Z\| \qquad \text{for all } Z \in \Omega_2.$$

In our study, we always use the Frobenius norm $\|X\| = [\operatorname{tr}(X^* X)]^{1/2}$, which is unitary similarity invariant. By the above theorem, we have

$$\Phi_{\Omega_2}(P) = U \operatorname{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2}) U^* \quad \text{ if } P = U \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{n_1 n_2}) U^* \text{ with } \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_{n_1 n_2}, \tag{6}$$

here U may not be unique if P has repeated eigenvalues and we just choose any one of them.

The next proposition, whose proof can be seen in Appendix A, provides an explicit formula for $\Phi_{\Omega_2}(P)$ using the Karush−Kuhn−Tucker (KKT) conditions. It connects our problem to other optimization problems. The result will also follow from Proposition 3.2, which covers the more general multipartite systems.

Proposition 2.2. *Given a block matrix $P = (P_{ij}) \in M_{n_1}(M_{n_2})$, the projection operator of P onto Ω_1 is given by*

$$\Phi_{\Omega_1}(P) = P - \frac{I_{n_1}}{n_1} \otimes \Big(\operatorname{tr}_1(P) - \rho_2\Big) - \Big(\operatorname{tr}_2(P) - \rho_1\Big) \otimes \frac{I_{n_2}}{n_2} + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(P) - 1}{n_1 n_2} I_{n_1 n_2} \tag{7}$$

Using equations (6) and (7), we can implement the following alternating projection algorithm to find $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with prescribed eigenvalues $(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2})$, if it exists.

Algorithm 2.3. Alternating projection scheme to find $\rho = \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2}(X_0)$.
Step 1. *Generate a random unitary U and a random probability vector $(d_1, \ldots, d_{n_1 \ldots n_k})$ and set the initial point to be $X_0 = U\text{diag}\,(d_1, \ldots, d_{n_1 \ldots n_k})U^*$. Choose an integer N (iteration limit) and a small positive number δ (tolerance).*
Step 2. *For $k = 1, \ldots, N$, define*

$$X_{2k-1} = \Phi_{\Omega_1}(X_{2k-2}) \quad \text{and} \quad X_{2k} = \Phi_{\Omega_2}(X_{2k-1})$$

If $||\text{tr}_1(X_{2k}) - \rho_2|| + ||\text{tr}_2(X_{2k}) - \rho_1|| < \delta$, then declare X_{2k} to be a solution.

If $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \neq \emptyset$, Theorem 4.3 of [8] guarantees local convergence of this algorithm. That is, if we choose a suitable starting point X_0, then the algorithm produces a sequence $\{X_k\}$ that converges to a $\rho \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ as $k \longrightarrow \infty$.

2.2. **Low rank solutions.** In this subsection, we discuss methods to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$. Such low rank solutions are of great interest as they are often entangled [9, Theorem 8]. In fact, if $\text{rank}\,(\rho) < \max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$, it was shown in [10, Theorem 1] that ρ must be distillable. It is also known (for example, see [11]) that if $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, then

$$\max\left\{\left\lceil \frac{n_2}{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1)} \right\rceil, \left\lceil \frac{n_1}{\text{rank}\,(\rho_2)} \right\rceil\right\} \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho) \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1)\text{rank}\,(\rho)_2$$

The upper bound is always attained by $\rho = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ but the lower bound is not always attained. For example, in [6, Subsection 3.3.1], it was shown that there exists a rank one $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ if and only if ρ_1 and ρ_2 are isospectral, that is, ρ_1 and ρ_2 have the same set of nonzero eigenvalues, counting multiplicities.

The following algorithm is an implementation of an alternating projection method to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, if it exists. Convergence of this algorithm is not guaranteed but numerical results shown in Section 4 illustrate that this algorithm is effective in finding a low rank solution.

Algorithm 2.4. Alternating projection scheme to find $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq r$.
Step 1: *Set $k = 0$ and choose $X_0 \in D_{n_1 n_2}$ and a positive integer N (iteration limit) and a small positive integer δ (tolerance). Do the next step for $k = 1, \ldots, N$.*
Step 2: *Define*

$$\rho^{(2k-1)} = \Phi_{\Omega_1}(\rho^{(2k-2)})$$

Then if $\rho^{(2k-1)} = U\text{diag}\,(d_1, \ldots, d_{n_1 n_2})U^*$ for some unitary U and $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_{n_1 n_2} \geq 0$, define

$$\rho^{(2k)} = U(s_1, \ldots, s_r, 0, \ldots, 0)U^*,$$

where $s_i = \max\{d_i, 0\}$. If $||\text{tr}_1(X_{2k}) - \rho_2|| + |\text{tr}_2(X_{2k}) - \rho_1|| < \delta$, then declare $\rho^{(2k)}$ as a solution.

In view of the fact that the above algorithm may not converge and multiple low rank solutions may exist, we derive other methods to find low rank solutions. Additionally, as we will see in Section 4, two of the algorithms produce a solution with low von Neumann entropy.

First, we present the following theorem [6] to construct a rank one solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(A, B)$ for isospectral A and B. Based on this, we present three algorithms to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}$ and $\rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$ have spectral decomposition $\rho_1 = \gamma_1 x_1 x_1^* + \cdots + \gamma_k x_k x_k^*$ and $\rho_2 = \gamma_1 y_1 y_1^* + \cdots + \gamma_k y_k y_k^*$, and*

$$w = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sqrt{\gamma_i}(x_i \otimes y_i)$$

Then $P = ww^* \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

In the first algorithm that we will present, we can choose an integer k with

$$\max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} \leq k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1) + \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) - 1$$

and construct a $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\text{rank}\,(\rho) = k$. We do this by expressing both ρ_1 and ρ_2 as an average of k pure states (see proof of Proposition 2.7 in Appendix A).

Algorithm 2.6. Scheme to find a rank k solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, where $\max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} \leq k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1) + \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) - 1$
Step 1: *Find unitaries U and V such that $A = U\text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})U^*$ and $B = V\text{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2})V^*$.*
Step 2: *Choose an integer k with $\max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} \leq k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1) + \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) - 1$ and let ω_k be a principal k^{th} root of unity. For any $i = 1, \ldots, k$, define $w_i \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $x_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $w_i = [\omega_k^{(j-1)i}\sqrt{a_j}]$ and $x_i = [\omega_k^{(j-1)i}\sqrt{b_j}]$.*
Step 3: *Define $\rho = z_1 z_1 * + \cdots + z_k z_k^*$ where*

$$z_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}(Uw_i \otimes Vx_i)$$

Proposition 2.7. *For any integer k with $\max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} \leq k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1) + \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) - 1$, Algorithm 2.6 produces a $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\text{rank}\,(\rho) = k$.*

In [12], it was proven that if there is a $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with rank k, then there is $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho) \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1)\text{rank}\,(\rho_2)$. The following theorem is a consequence of this but we will give a constructive proof (see Appendix A) by induction and using Proposition 2.7.

Theorem 2.8. *For any integer k such that $\max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} \leq k \leq \text{rank}\,(\rho_1)\text{rank}\,(\rho_2)$, there exists $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\text{rank}\,(\rho) = k$.*

Note that if $\min\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2)\} = 1$, then $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2\}$. Now, what remains to be seen is the case when $\text{rank}\,(\rho_1), \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) \geq 2$ and

$$\max\left\{\left\lceil \frac{n_2}{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1)} \right\rceil, \left\lceil \frac{n_1}{\text{rank}\,(\rho_2)} \right\rceil\right\} \quad \leq \quad k \quad \leq \quad \max\{\text{rank}\,(\rho_1) - 1, \text{rank}\,(\rho_2) - 1\}.$$

Can we find $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with rank k? In the next algorithm, we present one more scheme to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ using the following known result in [13].

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose $a_1 \geq b_1 \geq a_2 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_k \geq b_k \geq 0$. Define $d = [d_i] \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that*

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a_i = 0 \text{ or } a_j = a_i \text{ for some } j \neq i \\ \sqrt{\dfrac{\prod_{j=1}^{n}(b_j - a_i)}{-\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq i}}^{n}(a_j - a_i)}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then $\text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_k) - dd^*$ has eigenvalues $b_1, \ldots, b_k$.

Algorithm 2.10. Scheme to find $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\operatorname{rank}(\rho) \leq \max\{\operatorname{rank}(\rho_1), \operatorname{rank}(\rho_2)\}$.
Step 1: *Set $k = 0$ and $A_k = \rho_1$ and $B_k = \rho_2$.*
Step 2: *If $A_k = 0$, then stop. Otherwise do the following steps.*
Step 2.1: *Find unitary U, V such that*

$$A_k = U(S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_p \oplus T_1 \oplus T_q \oplus L_a)U^*$$

and

$$B_k = V(\tilde{S}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \tilde{S}_p \oplus \tilde{T}_1 \oplus \tilde{T}_q \oplus L_b)V^*$$

where

(1) $T_j = \operatorname{diag}(c_{j1}, \ldots, c_{jt_j})$ *and* $\tilde{T}_j = \operatorname{diag}(d_{j1}, \ldots, d_{jt_j})$ *satisfy* $d_{j1} \geq c_{j1} \geq \cdots \geq d_{jt_j} \geq c_{jt_j}$,
(2) $S_i = \operatorname{diag}(a_{i1}, \ldots, a_{is_i})$ *and* $\tilde{S}_i = \operatorname{diag}(b_{i1}, \ldots, b_{is_i})$ *satisfy* $a_{i1} \geq b_{i1} \geq \cdots \geq a_{is_i} \geq b_{is_i}$, *and*
(3) *either L_a is empty or is a zero block or L_b is empty or is a zero block.*

Step 2.2: *Use Lemma 2.9 to find $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{s_i}$ such that the eigenvalues of $S_i - x_i x_i^*$ are the eigenvalues of $\tilde{S}_i$. Similarly, find $y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{t_j}$ such that the eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}_j - y_i y_i^*$ are the same as that of T_j.*
Step 2.3: *Let*

$$C_k = U\Big((S_1 - x_1x_1^*) \oplus \cdots \oplus (S_p - x_px_p^*) \oplus T_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus T_q \oplus 0\Big)U^*$$

and

$$\tilde{C}_k = V\Big(\tilde{S}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \tilde{S}_p \oplus (\tilde{T}_1 - y_1y_1^*) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\tilde{T}_q - y_qy_q^*) \oplus 0\Big)V^*$$

and set $A_{k+1} = A_k - C_k$ and $B_{k+1} = B_k - \tilde{C}_k$ and repeat step 2.
Step 3: *For $i = 1, \ldots, k$, Find U_i and V_i such that*

$$C_i = U_i \operatorname{diag}(\alpha_{i1}, \ldots, \alpha_{ir_i}, 0, \ldots)U_i^* \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{C}_i = V_i \operatorname{diag}(\alpha_{i1}, \ldots, \alpha_{ir_i}, 0, \ldots)V_i^*$$

Define $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \sqrt{\alpha_{ij}}(U_i e_j \otimes V_i e_j)$.
Step 4: *Define $\rho = w_1w_1^* + \cdots + w_kw_k^*$.*

Proposition 2.11. *Let $\rho_1 = U\operatorname{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})U^*$ and $\rho_2 = V\operatorname{diag}(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_1})V^*$. Algorithm 2.10 produces positive semidefinite matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_k \in M_{n_1}$ and $\tilde{C}_1, \ldots, \tilde{C}_k \in M_{n_2}$ such that*

(1) $k \leq \max\{\operatorname{rank}(\rho_1), \operatorname{rank}(\rho_2)\}$,
(2) *C_i and C_j are isospectral,*
(3) *$\rho_1 = C_1 + \cdots + C_k$ and $\rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{C}_k$, and;*
(4) *If $a_{i_1} \geq b_{j_1} \geq \cdots \geq a_{i_l} \geq b_{j_l}$ (or $b_{j_1} \geq a_{i_1} \geq \cdots \geq b_{j_l} \geq a_{i_l}$) for some distinct indices $i_1, \ldots, i_{l+1}$ and distinct $j_1, \ldots, j_{l+1}$, then the solution ρ produced by Algorithm 2.10 has rank at most* $\max\{\operatorname{rank}(\rho_1) - l + 1, \operatorname{rank}(\rho_2) - l + 1\}$.

Finally, we present one more scheme to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$. Similar to Algorithm 2.10, we find ρ by first writing

$$\rho_1 = C_1 + \cdots + C_k \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + \ldots + \tilde{C}_k$$

for k pairs $(C_1, \tilde{C}_1), \ldots, (C_k, \tilde{C}_k) \in M_{n_1} \times M_{n_2}$, of isospectral positive semidefinite matrices with $k \leq \max\{\operatorname{rank}(\rho_1), \operatorname{rank}(\rho_2)\}$. In fact, these pairs can be chosen so that we can construct a

$\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ whose nonzero eigenvalues are given by $\lambda_i = \mathrm{tr}(C_i) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{C}_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Furthermore, this solution ρ satisfies

$$||\rho||_2 = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)} ||\sigma||_2,$$

where $||\cdot||_2$ denotes the operator/spectral norm.

Algorithm 2.12. Scheme to find $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with $\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho) \leq \max\{\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1), \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$.
Step 1: *Suppose* $\rho_1 = U\mathrm{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})U^*$ *and* $\rho_2 = V\mathrm{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2})V^*$. *Define*

$$a_i^{(0)} = a_i \quad \text{and} \quad b_i^{(0)} = b_i$$

Do the next step for $r = 0, 1, \ldots$
Step 2: *If* $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} a_i^{(r)} = 0$, *then stop. Otherwise, find* $\sigma_r \in S_{n_1}$ *such that* $a^{(r)}_{\sigma_r(1)} \geq \cdots \geq a^{(r)}_{\sigma_r(n_1)}$ *and* $\tilde{\sigma}_r \in S_{n_2}$ *such that* $b^{(r)}_{\tilde{\sigma}_r(1)} \geq \cdots \geq b^{(r)}_{\tilde{\sigma}_r(n_2)}$ *and denote by* P_r *and* $\tilde{P}_r$ *the permutation matrices satisfying*

$$P_r\mathrm{diag}\,(a_1^{(r)}, \ldots, a_{n_1}^{(r)})P_r^T = \mathrm{diag}\,(a^{(r)}_{\sigma_r(1)}, \ldots, a^{(r)}_{\sigma_r(n_1)})$$

$$\tilde{P}_r\mathrm{diag}\,(b_1^{(r)}, \ldots, b_{n_2}^{(r)})\tilde{P}_r^T = \mathrm{diag}\,(b^{(r)}_{\tilde{\sigma}_r(1)}, \ldots, b^{(k)}_{\tilde{\sigma}_r(n_2)})$$

Then, define

$$C_r = UP_k^T\mathrm{diag}\,(c_{r_1}, \ldots, c_{r_{n_1}})P_rU^*$$

and

$$\tilde{C}_r = V\tilde{P}_r^T\mathrm{diag}\,(c_{r_1}, \ldots, c_{r_{n_2}})\tilde{P}_rV^*$$

where $c_{r_j} = \min\{a^{(r)}_{\sigma_r(j)}, b^{(r)}_{\tilde{\sigma}_r(j)}\}$ *if* $j\{1, \ldots, \min\{n_1, n_2\}\}$ *and* $c_{r_j} = 0$ *otherwise. Then set*

$$a_i^{(r+1)} = a_i^{(r)} - c_{r_{\sigma_r^{-1}(j)}} \quad \text{and} \quad b_i^{(r+1)} = b_i^{(r)} - c_{r_{\tilde{\sigma}_r^{-1}(j)}}$$

and repeat step 2 for $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
Step 3: *For* $i = 1, \ldots, k$, *define* $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \sqrt{c_{ij}}(Ue_{\sigma_i(j)} \otimes Ve_{\tilde{\sigma}_i(j)})$ *and* $\rho = w_1w_1^* + \cdots + w_kw_k^*$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let* $\rho_1 \in D_{n_1}$ *and* $\rho_2 \in D_{n_2}$. *Algorithm 2.12 produces positive semidefinite matrices* $C_1, \ldots, C_k \in M_{n_1}$ *and* $\tilde{C}_1, \ldots, \tilde{C}_k \in M_{n_2}$ *such that*

(1) $k \leq \max\{\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1), \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$
(2) C_i *and* C_j *are isospectral*
(3) $\rho_1 = C_1 + \cdots + C_k$ *and* $\rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{C}_k$
(4) *If* $w_1, \ldots, w_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1n_2}$ *are the vectors defined in Step 3, then* $w_i * w_j = \delta_{ij}\mathrm{tr}\,(C_i)$.
(5) $||\rho||_2 = \mathrm{tr}\,(C_1) = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)} ||\sigma||_2$

Algorithm 2.12 can produce a solution ρ that has rank less than $\min\{\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1), \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$, but usually does not give the minimum rank. Take for example the case

$$\rho_1 = \mathrm{diag}\,\left(\frac{7}{10}, \frac{3}{10}\right) \text{ and } \rho_2 = \mathrm{diag}\,\left(\frac{3}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5}\right).$$

There is no $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with rank 1, but there is a rank 2 solution given by $\rho = w_1 w_1^* + w_2 w_2^*$, where

$$w_1 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}(e_1 \otimes e_1) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{10}}(e_2 \otimes e_2) \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{10}}(e_1 \otimes e_2) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}}(e_2 \otimes e_3)$$

However, Algorithm 2.12 will produce a rank 3 solution.

The fact that Algorithm 2.12 will produce a C_1 satisfying Proposition 2.13.(5) follows from [6] using algebraic combinatorics. We will give a simple matrix proof in Appendix A.

Note that the solutions obtained from Algorithms 2.6, 2.10, 2.12 can be utilized as the starting point when implementing Algorithm 2.4 to find a solution with lower rank. As mentioned in the beginning of Subsection 2.2, finding low rank $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ is of interest in the study of distillation. Here, we note that the solution obtained in Algorithm 2.12 has relatively low von Neumann entropy since it has maximal spectral norm, that is, its largest eigenvalue is as close to 1 as possible making it a good pure state approximation. However, as will be seen in the numerical results in Section 3, it is not guaranteed to have minimal von Neumann entropy.

2.3. **States attaining certain extremal conditions.** In this subsection, we are interested in finding $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ attaining certain extreme functional values for a given scalar function f on states. Our result will cover the case when $f(\rho)$ is the von-Neumann entropy of ρ defined by

$$S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho \log \rho) = -\sum \lambda_j \log(\lambda_j), \tag{8}$$

where λ_j are the eigenvalues of ρ, and $x \log x = 0$ if $x = 0$, and the Rényi entropy defined by

$$S_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho^\alpha) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum \lambda_j^\alpha \right) \qquad \text{for } \alpha \geq 0. \tag{9}$$

Note that $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ has maximum von Neumann entropy by the subadditivity property of von Neumann entropy. So, we focus on searching for $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with minimum entropy, that is, we are interested in the following minimization problem

$$\min_{\rho \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3} \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho \log \rho), \tag{10}$$

where

$$\Omega_3 = \{\rho \in M_{n_1}(M_{n_2}) : \rho \geq 0\}. \tag{11}$$

Here $\rho \geq 0$ means that the matrix ρ is positive semidefinite. Since Ω_1 and Ω_3 are closed convex sets, then the set $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$ is also a closed convex set. Now we use the nonmonotone spectral projected gradient (**NSPG**) method to solve the minimization problem (10), which was proposed in Birgin et al [14], on minimizing a continuously differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ on a nonempty closed convex set M. As it is quite simple to implement and very effective for large-scale problem, it has been extensively studied in the past years (see [15, 8] and their references for details). The NSPG method has the form $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$, where d_k is chosen to be $P_M(x_k - t_k \nabla f(x_k)) - x_k$ with $t_k > 0$ a precomputed scalar. The direction d_k is guaranteed to be a descent direction ([16, Lemma 2.1]) and the step length α_k is selected by a nonmonotone linear search strategy. The key problems to use NSPG method to solve (10) are how to compute the gradient of the objective function $f(\rho) = \mathrm{tr}\,\rho \log \rho$ and the projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$ of Z onto the set $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$. Such problems is addressed in the following.

For any function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, one can extend it to $f : H_n \to H_n$ such that $f(A) = \sum f(a_j)P_j$ if A has spectral decomposition $A = \sum a_j P_j$. where P_j is the orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{C}^n$ onto the kernel of $A - a_j I$. Furthermore, we can consider the scalar function $A \mapsto \operatorname{tr} f(A)$. By Theorem 1.1 in [15], we have the following.

Theorem 2.14. *Suppose $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable concave function with derived function $f'(x)$. Then the gradient function of the scalar function $A \mapsto \operatorname{tr} f(A)$ is given by $f'(A) = \sum f'(a_j)P_j$ if A has spectral decomposition $A = \sum a_j P_j$.*

Applying the result to the von Neumann entropy and Rényi entropy, we have

Corollary 2.15. *The gradient of the objective function $S(\rho) = \operatorname{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ is*

$$\nabla S(\rho) = \log \rho + I_{n_1 n_2}. \tag{12}$$

The gradient of the objective function $S_\alpha(\rho) = S_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \operatorname{tr}(\rho^\alpha) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum \lambda_j^\alpha \right)$ is

$$\nabla S_\alpha(\rho) = (\operatorname{tr} \rho^\alpha)^{-1} \alpha \rho^{\alpha-1}. \tag{13}$$

In the following, we compute the projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$. There is no analytic expression of $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$. Fortunately, we can use the Dykstra's algorithm to derive it, which can be stated in Algorithm 2.17. The following lemma is useful; see for example, [17, Theorem 2.1].

Lemma 2.16. *Let $Z \in H_{n_1 n_2}$ with spectral decomposition $U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1(Z), \cdots, \lambda_{n_1 n_2}(Z)) U^*$, where U is unitary. The projection of Z onto Ω_3 is*

$$\Phi_{\Omega_3}(Z) = U \operatorname{diag}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{n_1 n_2}) U^*, \tag{14}$$

where

$$t_i = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(Z), & \lambda_i(Z) \geq 0; \\ 0, & \lambda_i(Z) < 0. \end{cases}$$

In the following Dykstra's algorithm, the projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_1}(Z)$ is defined by Theorem 2.1 and the projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_3}(Z)$ is defined by Lemma 2.16.

Algorithm 2.17. Alternating Projection Scheme to find $\rho = \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$

Step 1. *Choose a positive integer N (iteration limit) and a small positive number δ (tolerance). Set $X_2^{(0)} = Z$ and do the following steps for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, N$.*

Step 2. *Compute $X_1^{(k)}$ and $X_2^{(k)}$ as follows*

$$X_1^{(k)} = \Phi_{\Omega_1}(X_2^{(k-1)}) \quad \text{and} \quad X_2^{(k)} = \Phi_{\Omega_3}(X_1^{(k)})$$

Step 3. *If $||X_1^{(k)} - X_2^{(k)}|| < \delta$, then stop and declare $X_2^{(k)}$ a solution.*

By Boyle and Dykstra [18], one can show that the matrix sequences $\{X_1^{(k)}\}$ and $\{X_2^{(k)}\}$ generated by Algorithm 2.17 converge to the projection $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$, that is

$$X_1^{(k)} \to \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z), \quad X_2^{(k)} \to \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z), \quad k \to +\infty.$$

Thus, Algorithm 2.17 will determine projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(Z)$.

Next, we use the nonmonotone spectral projected gradient method (see [16, 14] for more details) to solve the minimization problem (10). The algorithm starts with $\rho_0 \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$ and use an integer $M \geq 1$; a small parameter $\alpha_{\min} > 0$; a large parameter $\alpha_{\max} > \alpha_{\min}$; a sufficient decrease parameter

$r \in (0,1)$ and safeguarding parameters $0 < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < 1$. Initially, $\alpha_0 \in [\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}]$ is arbitrary. Given $\rho_t \in \Omega$ and $\alpha_t \in [\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}]$, Algorithm 2.18 describes how to obtain ρ_{t+1} and α_{t+1}, and when to terminate the process. In the following algorithm, the gradient $\nabla f(\rho)$ is defined in Lemma 2.16 and the projection operator $\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(\cdot)$ is computed by Algorithm 2.17

Algorithm 2.18. Scheme to solve Problem (10)

Step 1. *Detect whether the current point is stationary.*

If $\|\Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(\rho_t - \nabla f(\rho_t)) - \rho_t\|_F \leq tol$, *then stop and declare that* ρ_t *is a stationary point.*

Step 2. *Backtracking*

Step 2.1. *Compute* $d_t = \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(\rho_t - \alpha_t \nabla f(\rho_t)) - \rho_t$. *Set* $\lambda \leftarrow 1$.

Step 2.2. *Set* $\rho_+ = \rho_t + \lambda d_t$.

Step 2.3. *If*

$$f(\rho_+) \leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq \min\{t, M-1\}} f(\rho_{t-j}) + \gamma \lambda \langle d_t, \nabla f(\rho_t) \rangle, \tag{15}$$

then define $\lambda_t = \lambda,\ \rho_{t+1} = \rho_+,\ s_t = \rho_{t+1} - \rho_t,\ y_t = f(\rho_{t+1}) - f(\rho_t)$, *and go to Step 3.*

If (15) does not hold, define

$$\lambda_{new} = \frac{\sigma_1 \lambda + \sigma_2 \lambda}{2} \in [\sigma_1 \lambda, \sigma_2 \lambda],$$

set $\lambda \leftarrow \lambda_{new}$, *and go to Step 2.2.*

Step 3. *Compute* $b_t = \langle s_t, y_t \rangle$. *If* $b_t \leq 0$, *set* $\alpha_{t+1} = \alpha_{\max}$, *else, compute* $\alpha_t = \langle s_t, s_t \rangle$ *and*

$$\alpha_{t+1} = \min\{\alpha_{\max}, \max\{\alpha_{\min}, \frac{a_t}{b_t}\}\}.$$

By Theorem 2.2 in [15], one can show that the sequence $\{\rho_t\}$ generated by Algorithm 2.18 converges to the solution of the minimization problem (10).

A computational comment can be made on Algorithm 2.18. In order to guarantee the iterative sequence $\rho_t \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3, t = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, the initial value ρ_0 must be in $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$. Taking ρ_1 for example, if $\rho_0 \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$, then $\rho_1 = \rho_0 + \alpha_1 d_1 \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$, because $d_1 = \Phi_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3}(\rho_0 - t_0 \nabla f(\rho_0)) - x_0 \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_3$ and α_1 is a scalar.

3. Multipartite States

In this section, we will use projection methods to find a global state in a multipartite system with prescribed reduced states. That is, if $J_1, \ldots, J_m$ is given a family of subsystems of a k-partite system on $H_{n_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes H_{n_k}$ can we find a total state $\rho \in D_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ with prescribed reduced states

$$\mathrm{tr}_{J_1^c}(\rho) = \rho_{J_1}, \quad \mathrm{tr}_{J_2^c}(\rho) = \rho_{J_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathrm{tr}_{J_m^c}(\rho) = \rho_{J_m}.$$

For example, if $k = 3$, one may need to find a global state $\rho \in D_{n_1 n_2 n_3}$ with prescribed reduced states: $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_{23} \in D_{n_2 n_3}$ and $\mathrm{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_{12} \in D_{n_1 n_2}$. We will further require that the global state ρ to have prescribed eigenvalues.

We will extend the results in the previous section to multipartite systems. Note that the study is more challenging. For example, to find a global sate $\rho \in D_{n_1 \cdot n_2}$ with prescribed states $\mathrm{tr}_2(\rho) = \rho_1$ and $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_2$, one can replace (ρ, ρ_1, ρ_2) by $((U \otimes V)^* \rho (U \otimes V), U^* \rho_1 U, V^* \rho_2 V)$ for some suitable unitary $U \in M_{n_1}$ and $V \in M_{n_2}$ and assume that ρ_1, ρ_2 are in diagonal form. However, to find $\rho \in D_{n_1 n_2 n_3}$ with prescribed reduced states $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_{23}$ and $\mathrm{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_{12}$, there is no easy transform to reduce the problem to the case when ρ_{12} and ρ_{23} are in diagonal form.

To use the projection methods, we need to find the least square projection of a hermitian matrix $Z \in H_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ to the linear manifold

$$\mathcal{L} = \{X : \operatorname{tr}_{J_i^c}(X) = \rho_{J_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m\}. \tag{16}$$

In the following proposition, we answer this problem for $m = 1$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Given $Z \in H_{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes H_{n_k}$, the least square approximation of Z in $\mathcal{L} = \{\rho \in H_{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes H_{n_k} : \operatorname{tr}_{J^c}(\rho) = \sigma\}$ is given by*

$$\Phi_J(Z) = Z - \mathcal{M}_J(Z, \sigma), \tag{17}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_J(Z, \sigma) = P_J^T \left(\frac{I_{n_{J^c}}}{n_{J^c}} \otimes (\operatorname{tr}_{J^c}(Z) - \sigma) \right) P_J, \tag{18}$$

$n_{J^c} = \prod_{i \in J^c}^{k} n_i$ *and P_J is the permutation matrix such that*

$$P_J(\alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_k) P_J^T = \bigotimes_{i \in J^c} \alpha_i \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in J} \alpha_i. \tag{19}$$

Now, we use the notation introduced in equation (18) to give the formula for the general case.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $J_1, \ldots, J_m \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be defined as in (16). Then $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if for any subset $\{J_{i_1}, \ldots, J_{i_r}\}$ of $\{J_1, \ldots, J_m\}$, the following partial trace is fixed for all $t = 1, \ldots, r$*

$$\operatorname{tr}_{(\bigcap_{s=1}^{r} J_{i_s})^c}(\rho_{J_{i_t}}) := \rho_{\bigcap_{s=1}^{r} J_{i_s}}. \tag{20}$$

Furthermore, the least square approximation of a given $Z \in H_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ is

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(Z) = Z + \sum_{r=1}^{m} (-1)^r \sum_{\{J_{i_1}, \ldots, J_{i_r}\} \subseteq \{J_1, \ldots, J_m\}} \mathcal{M}_{\bigcap_{s=1}^{r} J_{i_s}} \left(Z, \rho_{\bigcap_{s=1}^{r} J_{i_s}} \right) \tag{21}$$

Suppose we are interested in looking for a tripartite state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{n_1 n_2 n_3}$ with given partial traces $\operatorname{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_{23}$ and $\operatorname{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_{12}$. Then we can use Proposition 3.2 to obtain the following projection formula.

Corollary 3.3. *The set*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} = \{\rho \in H_{n_1 n_2 n_3} : \operatorname{tr}_1(\rho) = \sigma_2 \in D_{n_2} \text{ and } \operatorname{tr}_3(\rho) = \sigma_1 \in D_{n_1}\} \tag{22}$$

is nonempty if and only if $\operatorname{tr}_{13}(\frac{I_{n_1}}{n_1} \otimes \sigma_2) = \gamma = \operatorname{tr}_{13}(\sigma_1 \otimes \frac{I_{n_2}}{n_2})$. In this case, the least square approximation of a given $Z \in H_{n_1 n_2 n_3}$ onto the set $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$ is given by

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}}(Z) = Z - \left[\frac{I_{n_1}}{n_1} \otimes (\operatorname{tr}_1(Z) - \sigma_2) \right] - \left[(\operatorname{tr}_3(Z) - \sigma_1) \otimes \frac{I_{n_3}}{n_3} \right] + \left[\frac{I_{n_1}}{n_1} \otimes (\operatorname{tr}_{13}(Z) - \gamma) \otimes \frac{I_{n_3}}{n_3} \right] + (\operatorname{tr}(Z) - 1) I_{n_1 n_2 n_3}$$

We employ the following alternating projection method to determine if there exists $\rho \in \Omega_3 \cap \mathcal{L}$, where

$$\Omega_3 = \{\rho \in M_N \ : \ \rho \geq 0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{L} = \{\rho \ : \ \operatorname{tr}_{J_1^c} = \sigma_{J_1}, \ldots, \operatorname{tr}_{J_m^c} = \sigma_{J_m}\}.$$

The following algorithm is a generalization of Algorithm 2.3 and 2.17 to multipartite systems. One must first check that $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$ using Proposition 3.2. We will use $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}$ and Φ_{Ω_3} are as defined by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 2.16.

Algorithm 3.4. For constructing a state $\rho \in \Omega_i \cap \mathcal{L}$, where $i = 2$ or $i = 3$.
Step 1. *Choose a positive integer N (say $N = 1000$) as iteration limit and a small positive integer δ (say $\delta = 10^{-15}$) as a error/tolerance value and set $k = 0$.*
Step 2. *Generate a random unitary U and a random probability vector $(d_1, \ldots, d_{n_1 \ldots n_k})$ and set the initial point to be $\rho_0 = U \mathrm{diag}\,(d_1, \ldots, d_{n_1 \ldots n_k}) U^*$. Do the next step for $k \leq N$.*
Step 3. *For $k \geq 1$, let $\rho_{2k-1} = \Phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{2k-2})$ and $\rho_{2k} = \Phi_{\Omega_i}(\rho_{2k-1})$ as defined by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 2.16 or Theorem 2.1. If $||\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho)_{2k} - \rho_2|| + ||\mathrm{tr}_2(\rho)_{2k} - \rho_1|| < \delta$, then stop and declare ρ_{2k} as a solution.*

4. Numerical Experiments

In this section, some examples are tested to illustrate that Algorithms 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.12 and 3.4 are feasible and effective to solve Problem 1.1. All experiments are performed in MATLAB R_{2015a} on a PC with an Intel Core i7 processor at 2.40GHz with machine precision $\varepsilon = 2.22 \times 10^{-16}$. The programs can be downloaded from http://cklixx.people.wm.edu/mathlib/projection/.

4.1. **Algorithm 2.3 for solving Problem 1.1 with the prescribed eigenvalues.** In this subsection, we present a simple numerical example to illustrate that Algorithm 2.3 is feasible to solve Problem 1.1 with the prescribed eigenvalues. In Algorithm 2.3, note that $X_{2k} \in \Omega_2$, that is, X_{2k} has the prescribed eigenvalues $c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1 n_2}$. Now, define

$$Err(X_{2k}) = \|\mathrm{tr}_1(X_{2k}) - \rho_2\| + \|\mathrm{tr}_2(X_{2k}) - \rho_1\|,$$

It is easy to see that $X_{2k} \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ if and only if $Err(X_k) = 0$. When implementing Algorithm 2.3, we declare X_{2k} a solution if $Err(X_{2k}) < \delta$ for some small positive number δ. If this criteria is not met after a set number of iterations, then the algorithm terminates.
Example 4.1. Set $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5, c_6) = (0.8329, 0.0781, 0.0529, 0.0238, 0.0109, 0.0015)$ and

$$\rho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.4922 & 0.2729 & 0.3138 \\ 0.2729 & 0.1980 & 0.1846 \\ 0.3138 & 0.1846 & 0.3098 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.52 & 0.3923 \\ 0.3923 & 0.48 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using Algorithm 2.3, we obtain the following solution after 214 iterations and $Err(X_{214}) \approx 3.38 \times 10^{-16}$.

$$X \approx X_{214} = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11}^{(214)} & X_{12}^{(214)} \\ X_{21}^{(214)} & X_{22}^{(214)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2826 & 0.1614 & 0.1582 & 0.1990 & 0.0908 & 0.1861 \\ 0.1614 & 0.1234 & 0.0945 & 0.1258 & 0.0601 & 0.1234 \\ 0.1582 & 0.0945 & 0.1140 & 0.1088 & 0.0470 & 0.1333 \\ 0.1990 & 0.1258 & 0.1088 & 0.2096 & 0.1115 & 0.1556 \\ 0.0908 & 0.0601 & 0.0470 & 0.1115 & 0.0746 & 0.0901 \\ 0.1861 & 0.1234 & 0.1333 & 0.1556 & 0.0901 & 0.1958 \end{pmatrix},$$

Example 4.1 illustrates the effectiveness of Algorithm 2.3 in solving Problem 1.1 with prescribed eigenvalues.

4.2. **Algorithms 2.4, 2.6 , 2.10 and 2.12 to find low rank solutions.** In Subsection 2.2, we discussed four different algorithms to find a low rank solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Let $r_1 = \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1)$ and $r_2 = \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)$ and $r = \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho)$. Also, let $err = \max\{||\rho_1 - \mathrm{tr}_2(\rho)||, ||\rho_2 - \mathrm{tr}_1(\rho)||\}$. Denote by λ_M and λ_μ the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of ρ, respectively; and *ent* the Von Neumman entropy of ρ. The following table illustrates the performance of each algorithm.

Example 4.2
In this example, we consider ρ_1 and ρ_2 with eigenvalues

$$\lambda(\rho_1) = (0.5951, 0.2341, 0.1708) \quad \lambda(\rho_2) = (0.6124, 0.1926, 0.1654, 0.0296)$$

	(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	r	CPU-time	err	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
Alg2.6	(3,4)	(3,4)	4	0.002s	3.54294e-17	0.399619	-6.00329e-17	1.27929
Alg2.10	(3,4)	(3,4)	3	0.006s	1.11022e-16	0.9313	-1.48157e-16	0.297223
Alg2.12	(3,4)	(3,4)	3	0.004s	1.11022e-16	0.9531	-4.1612e-17	0.215848

Using Algorithm 2.4, we determine if we can find a solution of rank $2, \ldots, \text{rank}\,(X_0) - 1$, where X_0 is a solution obtained from one of the algorithms above. Here are the solutions we obtained.

(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	X_0	r	# iter	CPU-time	err	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
(3,4)	(3,4)	alg. 2.10	2	1336	0.54s	9.34747e-16	0.9017	-4.16498e-17	0.321332
(3,4)	(3,4)	alg. 2.12	2	3103	1.266s	9.85657e-16	0.9531	-5.19103e-17	0.189284

Note that in this case, the solution obtained by Algorithm 2.4 using the solution from Algorithm 2.12 as initial point, has minimum entropy in $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$. This is because ρ is rank 2 and the largest eigenvalue of ρ is the maximum possible eigenvalue of any element of $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Example 4.3 In this example, we consider $\rho_1 \in D_6, \rho_2 \in D_8$ such that

$$\lambda(\rho_1) = (0.8213, 0.1234, 0.0553) \text{ and } \lambda(\rho_2) = (0.5720, 0.3068, 0.1000, 0.0189, 0.0020, 0.0003)$$

Algorithm	(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	r	CPU-time	err	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
2.6	(3,6)	(3,6)	6	0.003s	8.9182e-16	0.469983	-4.93499e-17	1.19924
2.10	(3,6)	(3,6)	4	0.005s	3.31468e-16	0.690947	-6.27654e-17	0.632879
2.12	(3,6)	(3,6)	6	0.004s	2.78333e-16	0.750675	-5.4791e-17	0.755308

Algorithm 2.4

(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	X_0	r	# iter	CPU-time	err1	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
(3,6)	(3,6)	alg. 2.12	3	76933	44.25s	9.90465e-16	0.729479	-5.79165e-17	0.736448
(3,6)	(3,6)	alg. 2.10	2	100000	63.5203s	2.26889e-08	0.690947	-1.44764e-16	0.618341
(3,6)	(3,6)	alg. 2.10	3	6707	4.39s	9.83117e-16	0.690947	-6.84736e-17	0.631907

Example 4.4 In this example, we consider $\rho_1 \in D_6, \rho_2 \in D_8$ such that

$$\lambda(\rho_1) = (0.2272, 0.2136, 0.1946, 0.1474, 0.1341, 0.0831)$$

and $$\lambda(\rho_2) = (0.2399, 0.1699, 0.1638, 0.1463, 0.1246, 0.0851, 0.0407, 0.0297)$$

Algorithm	(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	r	CPU-time	err	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
2.6	(6,8)	(6,8)	8	0.005s	2.56989e-16	0.151124	-3.91005e-17	2.0642
2.10	(6,8)	(6,8)	3	0.014s	4.38087e-16	0.840737	-1.36117e-16	0.515135
2.12	(6,8)	(6,8)	4	0.017s	3.08212e-16	0.914875	-1.05048e-16	0.308127

Algorithm 2.4

(m,n)	(r_1,r_2)	X_0	r	# iter	CPU-time	err1	λ_M	λ_μ	ent
(6,8)	(6,8)	alg. 2.12	3	26770	45.955s	8.97652e-16	0.914681	-8.7338e-17	0.308847

4.3. **Algorithm 3.4 for solving Problem 1.1 with multipartite states.** In this section, we give two examples using Algorithm 3.4 to find a global state in a multipartite system with prescribed reduced states and prescribed eigenvalues.

Example 4.5. We implement Algorithm 3.4, for $i = 3$, to find a tripartite state $\rho \in D(2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2)$ such that $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_1$ and $\mathrm{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_2$, where

$$\rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.181375 & 0.161 & 0.1678 & 0.1417 \\ 0.161 & 0.314875 & 0.2653 & 0.1937 \\ 0.1678 & 0.2653 & 0.307275 & 0.1863 \\ 0.1417 & 0.1937 & 0.1863 & 0.196475 \end{pmatrix} \in D(2^2),$$

$$\rho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.214875 & 0.1653 & 0.1926 & 0.1934 \\ 0.1653 & 0.264475 & 0.2166 & 0.1888 \\ 0.1926 & 0.2166 & 0.281375 & 0.1962 \\ 0.1934 & 0.1888 & 0.1962 & 0.239275 \end{pmatrix} \in D(2^2).$$

The algorithm produces the solution

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0811 & 0.0809 & 0.0747 & 0.0654 & 0.0850 & 0.0901 & 0.0923 & 0.07 \\ 0.0809 & 0.1338 & 0.1189 & 0.0906 & 0.0898 & 0.1076 & 0.1003 & 0.1011 \\ 0.0747 & 0.1189 & 0.1637 & 0.0893 & 0.1053 & 0.0658 & 0.0944 & 0.0947 \\ 0.0654 & 0.0906 & 0.0893 & 0.1008 & 0.0728 & 0.1113 & 0.1013 & 0.0944 \\ 0.085 & 0.0898 & 0.1053 & 0.0728 & 0.1003 & 0.0801 & 0.0931 & 0.0763 \\ 0.0901 & 0.1076 & 0.0658 & 0.1113 & 0.0801 & 0.1811 & 0.1464 & 0.1031 \\ 0.0923 & 0.1003 & 0.0944 & 0.1013 & 0.0931 & 0.1464 & 0.1436 & 0.097 \\ 0.07 & 0.1011 & 0.0947 & 0.0944 & 0.0763 & 0.1031 & 0.097 & 0.0957 \end{pmatrix}$$

with an error of order not more than 10^{-16}. This rank 6 solution is found after approximately 400 iterations, where one iteration consists of a projection on Φ_3 and a projection on $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}$. The result was obtained in approximately 0.3 seconds. Note that if $n_1 = n_3 = 2$ and n_2 is increased to $n = 8$, this program still obtains a solution relatively fast and accurately.

Example 4.6. We implement Algorithm 3.4, for $i = 2$, to find $\rho \in D_8$ with $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_1$, $\mathrm{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_2$ (as in the previous example) with the additional condition that the eigenvalues of ρ are

$$\lambda(\rho) = (0.8034, 0.0889, 0.05204, 0.0284, 0.0188, 0.0051, 0.0032, 0.0001).$$

The algorithm ran in under 0.2 seconds and approximately 300 iterations to produce the solution

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1507 & 0.1056 & 0.0999 & 0.0769 & 0.1047 & 0.0966 & 0.1264 & 0.1293 \\ 0.1056 & 0.1209 & 0.0977 & 0.0716 & 0.0813 & 0.0792 & 0.1248 & 0.1018 \\ 0.0999 & 0.0977 & 0.1144 & 0.0680 & 0.0879 & 0.0685 & 0.1241 & 0.1100 \\ 0.0769 & 0.0716 & 0.0680 & 0.1274 & 0.1053 & 0.0559 & 0.0836 & 0.0821 \\ 0.1047 & 0.0813 & 0.0879 & 0.1053 & 0.1160 & 0.0818 & 0.0990 & 0.1055 \\ 0.0966 & 0.0792 & 0.0685 & 0.0559 & 0.0818 & 0.0832 & 0.0795 & 0.0870 \\ 0.1264 & 0.1248 & 0.1241 & 0.0836 & 0.0990 & 0.0795 & 0.1549 & 0.1297 \\ 0.1293 & 0.1018 & 0.1100 & 0.0821 & 0.1055 & 0.0870 & 0.1297 & 0.1324 \end{pmatrix}$$

with with an error of order not more than 10^{-16}.

Example 4.7. In this example, we illustrate Algorithm 3.4 for the case that $\rho \in D(8)$ and $\mathrm{tr}_3(\rho) = \rho_{12} = \rho_{13} = \mathrm{tr}_2(\rho)$. Let

$$\rho_{12} = \rho_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2471 & 0.1842 & 0.1738 & 0.2546 \\ 0.1842 & 0.2277 & 0.1386 & 0.2144 \\ 0.1738 & 0.1386 & 0.182 & 0.2303 \\ 0.2546 & 0.2144 & 0.2303 & 0.3432 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This type of problem is an example of a 2−symmetric extension problem. In [19], the existence of a solution to such a problem was characterized using the concept of separability of quantum states. Using Algorithm 3.8, we find a solution

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1302 & 0.1096 & 0.1111 & 0.1071 & 0.0615 & 0.1156 & 0.1151 & 0.1470 \\ 0.1096 & 0.1169 & 0.1147 & 0.0731 & 0.0554 & 0.1123 & 0.1139 & 0.1395 \\ 0.1111 & 0.1147 & 0.1169 & 0.0746 & 0.0547 & 0.1152 & 0.1123 & 0.1390 \\ 0.1071 & 0.0731 & 0.0746 & 0.1108 & 0.0483 & 0.0839 & 0.0832 & 0.1021 \\ 0.0615 & 0.0554 & 0.0547 & 0.0483 & 0.0322 & 0.0649 & 0.0650 & 0.0789 \\ 0.1156 & 0.1123 & 0.1152 & 0.0839 & 0.0649 & 0.1498 & 0.1427 & 0.1653 \\ 0.1151 & 0.1139 & 0.1123 & 0.0832 & 0.0650 & 0.1427 & 0.1408 & 0.1641 \\ 0.1470 & 0.1395 & 0.1390 & 0.1021 & 0.0789 & 0.1653 & 0.1641 & 0.2024 \end{pmatrix}$$

with an error of order 10^{-17} after 2353 iterations in 1.9 seconds.

5. Concluding remarks and further research

In this paper, we use projection methods to construct (global) quantum states with prescribed reduced (marginal) states, and specific ranks and possibly extreme Von Neumann or Renyi entropy. Using convex analysis, optimization techniques on matrix manifolds, we obtained convergent algorithms to solve the problem. Matlab programs were written based on these algorithms, and numerical examples of low dimension cases were demonstrated. There are many problems deserving further investigations. We mention a few of them in the following.

(1) We have only demonstrated our algorithms with low dimension examples. It is interesting to improve the algorithm so that it can deal with practical problems (of large sizes).
(2) Besides the alternating projection methods, it is interesting to study other schemes such as the Douglas-Rachford reflection method (for example, see [20, 21, 22]) to solve our problem.
(3) If it is impossible to find a pure state with the prescribed reduced sates, one might try to construct a global state with minimum rank. The set of matrices in $D_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ with a fixed rank, or bounded ranks, has complicated geometry. A test to determine if a solution produced has minimum rank is lacking.

Acknowledgment

Duan was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11561015; 11261014; 11301107), and the Natural Science Foundation of Guangxi Province (No.2012GXNSFBA053006; 2013GXNSFBA019009). Li is an affiliated member of the Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo. He is also an honorary professor of the Shanghai University, and the University of Hong Kong; his research was supported by the USA NSF grant DMS 1331021, the Simons Foundation Grant 351047, and the NNSF of China Grant 11571220.

References

[1] K. Kraus, "States, effects, and operations : Fundamental notions of quantum theory," in *Lectures in Mathematical Physics at the University of Texas at Austin*, vol. 190 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983.

[2] M. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[3] S. Daftuar and P. Hayden, "Quantum state transformations and the schubert calculus," *Ann. Phys.*, vol. 315, pp. 80–122, 2005.

[4] A. Klyachko, "Quantum marginal problem and n-representability," *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 36, pp. 72–86, 2006.

[5] W. Fulton, "Eigenvalues, invariant factors, highest weights and schubert calculus," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 37, no. 209249, 2000.

[6] A. Klaychko, "Quantum marginal problem and representations of the symmetric group," 2004.

[7] B. Arnold, A. W. Marshall, and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Application (2nd edition)*. Springer New York, 2011.

[8] A. Lewis and J. Malick, "Alternating projections on manifolds," *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 33, pp. 216–234, 2008.

[9] M. Ruskai and E. Werner, "Bipartite states of low rank are almost surely entangled," 2008.

[10] B. M. T. P. Horodecki, J. A. Smolin and A. V. Thapliyal, "Rank two bipartite bound entangled states do not exist," 2001.

[11] J. Watrous, "Theory of quantum information lecture notes," 2011.

[12] C.-K. Li, Y.-T. Poon, and X. Wang, "Ranks and eigenvalues of states with prescribed reduced states," *Elec. J. Lin. Alg.*, vol. 27, pp. 935–950, 2014.

[13] G. Golub, "Some modified matrix eigenvalue problems," *SIAM Review*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1973.

[14] E. G. Birgin, J. M. Martínez, and M. Raydan, "Inexact spectral projected gradient methods on convex sets," *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, vol. 23, pp. 539–559, 2003.

[15] A. Lewis, "Derivatives of spectral function," *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 21, pp. 576–588, 1996.

[16] E. G. Birgin, J. M. Martínez, and M. Raydan, "Nonmonotone spectral projected gradient methods on convex sets," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 10, pp. 1196–1211, 2000.

[17] N. Higham, "Computing a nearest symmetric positive semidefinite matrix," *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, vol. 103, pp. 103–118, 1988.

[18] J. P. Boyle and R. L. Dykstra, "A method for finding projections onto the intersection of convex sets in hilbert spaces," in *Advances in Order Restricted Statistical Inference*, vol. 37 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*, pp. 28–47, Springer New York, 1986.

[19] J. Chen, Z. Ji, N. Yu, and B. Zeng, "Detecting consistency of overlapping quantum marginals by separability," 2015.

[20] J. Douglas and H. Rachford, "On the numerical solution of heat conduction problems in two and three space variables," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 82, p. 421439, 1956.

[21] B. Svaiter, "On weak convergence of the douglas-rachford method," *SIAM J. Cont. and Opt.*, vol. 49, p. 280287, 2011.

[22] H. M. Phan, "Linear convergence of the douglas-rachford method for two closed sets," 2014.

[23] C.-K. Li, Y.-T. Poon, and T. Schulte-Herbruggen, "Least-squares approximation by elements from matrix orbits achieved by gradient flows on compact lie groups," *Math. Comp.*, vol. 275, pp. 1601–1621, 2011.

(Duan) College of Mathematics and Computational Science, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, Guilin 541004, P.R. China. duanxuefeng@guet.edu.cn

(Li) Department of Mathematics, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187, USA. ckli@math.wm.edu

(Pelejo) Department of Applied Science, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187, USA. , dcpelejo@gmail.com

Appendix A. Section 2 Proofs

Proof of Proposition 2.2:
Let $\Phi_{\Omega_1}(P) = (X_{ij})$, where $X_{ij} \in M_{n_2}$ and let $\rho_1 = [a_{ij}]$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, n_1$. We wish to show that

$$X_{ij} = P_{ij} + \delta_{ij}\frac{1}{n_1}\left(\rho_2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P_{ii}\right) + \frac{1}{n_2}\left(a_{ij} - \mathrm{tr}\,(P_{ij}) + \delta_{ij}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\,(P)-1}{n_1}\right) I_{n_2} \tag{23}$$

Since Ω_1 is a closed and convex set, then by the definition of projection operator we obtain that $\Phi_{\Omega_1}(P)$ is the unique solution of the minimization problem

$$\min_{X\in\Omega_1} \|P - X\|^2 = \min_{X\in\Omega_1} \sum_{1\le i\le n_1} \|P_{ii} - X_{ii}\|^2 + \sum_{1\le i\ne j\le n_1} \|P_{ij} - X_{ij}\|^2, \tag{23.1}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{X_{11}+X_{22}+\cdots+X_{n_1,n_1}=\rho_2} \sum\limits_{1\le i\le n_1} \|P_{ii} - X_{ii}\|^2 + \min\limits_{\mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ij})=a_{ij}, 1\le i\ne j\le n_1} \sum\limits_{1\le i\ne j\le n_1} \|P_{ij} - X_{ij}\|^2. \\ \mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii}) = a_{ii}, 1 \le i \le n_1 \end{cases} \tag{23.2}$$

Now we begin to solve the minimization problems

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{X_{11}+X_{22}+\cdots+X_{n_1,n_1}=\rho_2} \sum\limits_{1\le i\le n_1} \|P_{ii} - X_{ii}\|^2 \\ \mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii}) = a_{ii}, 1 \le i \le n_1 \end{cases} \tag{23.3}$$

and

$$\min_{\mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ij})=a_{ij}, 1\le i\ne j\le n_1} \sum_{1\le i\ne j\le n_1} \|P_{ij} - X_{ij}\|^2, \tag{23.4}$$

respectively.

It is easy to verify that the minimization problem (23.3) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii})=a_{ii}, i=2,\cdots,n_1} \|P_{11} - (\rho_2 - X_{22} - \cdots - X_{n_1,n_1})\|^2 + \sum_{2\le i\le n_1} \|P_{ii} - X_{ii}\|^2. \tag{23.5}$$

In fact, the equality $a_{11} = \mathrm{tr}\,(X_{11}) = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho_2 - X_{22} - \cdots - X_{n_1,n_1})$ always holds if $\mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii}) = a_{ii}, i = 2, 3, \cdots, n_1$ because ρ_1 and ρ_2 are density matrices, i.e., $\mathrm{tr}\,(A) = \mathrm{tr}\,(B) = 1$. Now we begin to solve (23.5) instead of (23.3). Since the objective function of (23.5) is a convex function and its feasible set is a convex set, then the KKT point is the solution of (23.5). Set the Lagrangian function of (23.5) is

$$L(X, \zeta) = \|P_{11} - (\rho_2 - X_{22} - \cdots - X_{n_1,n_1})\|^2 + \sum_{2\le i\le n_1} \|P_{ii} - X_{ii}\|^2 - \sum_{2\le i\le n_1} \zeta_{ii}(\mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii}) - a_{ii}),$$

where $\zeta = (\zeta_2, \zeta_3, \cdots, \zeta_{n_1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1-1}$. Hence we can derive that the optimality conditions of (23.5) are

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_{X_{22}} L(X,\zeta) &= (P_{11} - \rho_2 + X_{22} + \cdots + X_{n_1,n_1}) + (X_{22} - P_{22}) + \frac{1}{2}\zeta_2 I_{n_2} = 0, \\ \nabla_{X_{33}} L(X,\zeta) &= (P_{11} - \rho_2 + X_{22} + \cdots + X_{n_1,n_1}) + (X_{33} - P_{33}) + \frac{1}{2}\zeta_3 I_{n_2} = 0, \\ &\vdots \\ \nabla_{X_{n_1,n_1}} L(X,\zeta) &= (P_{11} - \rho_2 + X_{22} + \cdots + X_{n_1,n_1}) + (X_{n_1,n_1} - P_{n_1,n_1}) + \frac{1}{2}\zeta_{n_1} I_{n_2} = 0 \\ \nabla_{\zeta_i} L(X,\zeta) &= \mathrm{tr}\,(X_{ii}) - a_{ii} = 0, \quad 2 \le i \le n_1, \end{cases}$$

which imply that the KKT points of (23.5) are

$$X_{ii} = T + P_{ii} + \frac{1}{n_2}\left(a_{ii} - \mathrm{tr}\left(P_{ii}\right)\right) I_{n_2}, \quad 1 \le i \le n_1. \tag{23.6}$$

where

$$T = \frac{1}{n_1}\left(\rho_2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P_{ii}\right) - \frac{1}{n_1 n_2}\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P_{ii}\right) I_{n_2} = \frac{1}{n_1}\left(\rho_2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P_{ii}\right) + \frac{1 - \mathrm{tr}\left(P\right)}{n_1 n_2} I_{n_2}$$

These KKT points are also the unique solution of the minimization problem (23.5). Noting that (23.3) and (23.5) are equivalent, then (23.6) are also the unique solution of (23.3).

Next we will solve the minimization problem (23.4). Since the objective function of (23.4) is a convex function and its feasible set is a convex set, then the KKT point is the solution of problem (23.4). Set the Lagrangian function of (23.4) is

$$L(X, \mu) = \sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n_2} \|P_{ij} - X_{ij}\|^2 - \sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n_2} \mu_{ij}(\mathrm{tr}\left(P_{ij}\right) - a_{ij}),$$

where $\mu = (\mu_{12}, \mu_{13}, \cdots, \mu_{(n_1, n_1 - 1)}) \in \mathbb{C}^{\frac{1}{2} n_1 (n_1 - 1)}$.

By the optimality conditions

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_{X_{ij}} L(X, \mu) &= -2P_{ij} + 2X_{ij} - \mu_{ij} I_{n_2} = 0, \quad 1 \le i \ne j \le n_1, \\ \nabla_{\mu_{ij}} L(P, \mu) &= \mathrm{tr}\left(X_{ij}\right) - a_{ij} = 0, \quad 1 \le i \ne j \le n_1, \end{cases}$$

we obtain the KKT point of the minimization problem (6.4) are

$$X_{ij} = P_{ij} + \frac{1}{n_2}(a_{ij} - \mathrm{tr}\left(P_{ij}\right)) I_{n_2}, \quad 1 \le i \ne j \le n, \tag{23.7}$$

which are also the unique solution of (23.4).

Combining (23.6), (23.7) and (23.2) we see that the projection operator of P onto the set Ω_1 is indeed given by equation (23). □

Proof of Proposition 2.7:
Without loss of generality, suppose $n_1 \le n_2$. Suppose $\rho_1 = (a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})$ and $\rho_2 = \mathrm{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2})$ are positive definite and

$$n_2 \le k \le n_1 + n_2 - 1.$$

Note that $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i u_i^*$ and $\rho_2 = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i v_i^*$, where ω_k is a principal k^{th} root of unity and

$$u_i = [\omega_k^{(j-1)(i-1)}\sqrt{a_j}] \quad \text{and} \quad v_i = [\omega_k^{(l-1)(i-1)}\sqrt{b_l}]$$

Define $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{k}(u_i u_i^* \otimes v_i v_i^*)$. Clearly, $\mathrm{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_2$ and $\mathrm{tr}_2(\rho) = \rho_1$. Let P be the $n_1 n_2 \times k$ matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \otimes v_1 & u_2 \otimes v_2 & \cdots & u_k \otimes v_k \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad D = \mathrm{diag}\,(1, \omega_k, \omega_k^2, \ldots, \omega_k^{k-1})$$

so that $\rho = \frac{1}{k} P P^*$. Let

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \omega_k & \cdots & \omega_k^{k-1} \\ & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega_k^{n-1} & \cdots & \omega_k^{(k-1)(n_2-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then

$$P = \text{diag}\left(\sqrt{a_1}, \ldots, \sqrt{a_{n_1}}\right) \otimes \text{diag}\left(\sqrt{b_1}, \ldots, \sqrt{b_{n_2}}\right) \begin{bmatrix} F \\ FD \\ \vdots \\ FD^{k-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that FD^i consists of the $(1+i)^{th}$ up to the $(n_2+i)^{th}$ row of the discrete $k \times k$ Fourier matrix, which is a unitary matrix. Hence, P has k linearly independent rows consisting of rows $1, \ldots, n_2, 2n_2, 3n_2 \ldots, (k-n_2+1)n_2$. Counting all the linearly independent rows of P, we get that $\text{rank}\,(P) = \text{rank}\,(\rho) = k$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.8:
Assume without loss of generality that $n_1 \leq n_2$, $\text{rank}\,(\rho_1) = n_1$, $\text{rank}\,(\rho_2) = n_2$ and that $\rho_1 = \text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})$ and $\rho_2 = \text{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2})$.

If $n_1 = 1$ (or $n_2 = 1$), then $\mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2\}$ and $\text{rank}\,(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = n_2$ (or $\text{rank}\,(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = n_1$).

We will prove the general statement using induction on $n_1 + n_2$. By the preceding remark, the statement holds for $n_1 + n_2 = 2$. Now, suppose that for any the statement holds for $2 \leq n_1 + n_2 < r$. That is, for any $n_2 \leq k \leq n_1 n_2$, there exists a rank k solution $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Consider the case $n_1 + n_2 = r$. By Proposition 2.7, for any $n_1 \leq k \leq n_1 + n_2 - 1$ there is a rank k solution $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{n_1 n_2}$ such that $\text{tr}_1(\rho) = \rho_2$ and $\text{tr}_2(\rho) = \rho_1$.

(1) If $n_1 = 1$, then we are done.
(2) If $1 < n_1 < n_2$, then using the induction hypothesis, we know that for any $n_2 - 1 \leq k \leq n_1(n_2 - 1)$ there is a rank k positive semidefinite ρ such that

$$\text{tr}_1(\rho) = \text{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2-1}, 0) \text{ and } \text{tr}_2(\rho) = \text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1}).$$

Now, let $\hat{\rho} = \rho + \text{diag}\,(0, \ldots, 0, b_{n_2}) \otimes \text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1}) \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ and has rank equal to $\text{rank}\,(\rho) + n_1$. Thus, ρ can be chosen so that $\hat{\rho}$ has rank ranging from $n_1 + n_2 - 1$ to $n_1 n_2$. Together with Proposition 2.7, this shows that there is a solution of rank k for any $n_2 \leq k \leq n_1 n_2$.
(3) If $1 < n_1 = n_2$, then using the induction hypothesis, we know that for any $n_2 \leq k \leq (n_1 - 1)n_2$ there is a rank k positive semidefinite ρ such that

$$\text{tr}_1(\rho) = \text{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2}) \text{ and } \text{tr}_2(\rho) = \text{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1-1}, 0).$$

Now, let $\hat{\rho} = \rho + \text{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2}) \otimes \text{diag}\,(0, \ldots, 0, a_{n_1}) \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ has rank equal to $\text{rank}\,(\rho) + n_2$. Thus, $\hat{\rho}$ can have rank ranging from $2n_2$ to $n_1 n_2$. Together with Proposition 2.7, this shows that there is a solution of rank k for any $n_2 \leq k \leq n_1 n_2$.

By the principle of mathematical induction, we see that the theorem holds for all $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2$. □

Proof of Proposition 2.11:
Note that in Algorithm 2.10, A_k and B_k are positive semidefinite for every iteration k. The recursive process terminates at iteration k when $\text{rank}\,(A_k) = 0$. From the construction, we get

$$\text{rank}\,(A_{k+1}) = \text{rank}\,(A_k) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} \text{rank}\,(S_i)\right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{q} \text{rank}\,(T_j)\right) + p$$

$$\text{rank}\,(B_{k+1}) = \text{rank}\,(B_k) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} \text{rank}\,(\tilde{S}_i)\right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{q} \text{rank}\,(\tilde{T}_j)\right) + q$$

Since $\mathrm{tr}(A_k) = \mathrm{tr}(B_k)$ and A_k, B_k are both positive semidefinite, then there exists $a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, b_{j_1}, b_{j_2}$ such that $a_{i_1} \geq b_{j_1}$ and $b_{j_2} \geq a_{j_2}$. We have $p, q \geq 1$. Hence, $\mathrm{rank}\,(A_{k+1}) < \mathrm{rank}\,(A_k)$ and $\mathrm{rank}\,(B_{k+1}) < \mathrm{rank}\,(B_k)$ so that the process terminates after at most $\max\{\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1), \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$ steps. Clearly C_i and $\tilde{C}_i$ are positive semidefinite and are isospectral and $\rho_1 = C_1 + \cdots + C_k$ and $\rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{C}_k$.

If $a_{i_1} \geq b_{j_1} \geq \cdots \geq a_{i_l} \geq b_{j_l}$ (or $b_{j_1} \geq a_{i_1} \geq \cdots \geq b_{j_l} \geq a_{i_l}$) for some distinct indices $i_1, \ldots, i_{l+1}$ and distinct $j_1, \ldots, j_{l+1}$, then $\rho_1 = C_1 + A_1$ and $\rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + B_1$ where $\mathrm{rank}\,(A_1) \leq \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1) - l$ and $\mathrm{rank}\,(B_1) \leq \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2) - l$. □

Proof of Proposition 2.13:
Assume without loss of generality that $n_1 \leq n_2$ and

$$\rho_1 = U\mathrm{diag}\,(a_1, \ldots, a_{n_1})U^* \text{ and } \rho_2 = V\mathrm{diag}\,(b_1, \ldots, b_{n_2})V^*,$$

where $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_{n_1}$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq b_{n_2}$. For any $i = 1, \ldots, n_1$, define $c_i = \min\{a_i, b_i\}$ and $c_{n_1+1} = \cdots = c_{n_2} = 0$ and define $C_1 = \mathrm{diag}\,(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_1})$ and $\tilde{C}_1 = \mathrm{diag}\,(c_1, \ldots, c_{n_2})$. Then $\rho_1 - C_1$ is positive semidefinite and has rank at least one less than $\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1)$. Similarly, Then $\rho_2 - \tilde{C}_1$ is positive semidefinite and has rank at least one less than $\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)$. We can replace ρ_1 and ρ_2 by $\rho_1 - C_1$ and $\rho_2 - \tilde{C}_1$ and repeat the above process until both matrices become zero. This process will take at most $k = \max\{\mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_1), \mathrm{rank}\,(\rho_2)\}$ steps because the rank of ρ_1 and ρ_2 are reduced by at least one in each step. At the end of this process, we will be able to write ρ_1 and ρ_2 as $\rho_1 = C_1 + \cdots + C_k$ and $\rho_2 = \tilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{C}_k$ such that for each i,

$$C_i = \mathrm{diag}\,(c_{i_1}, \ldots, c_{i_{n_1}}) \text{ and } \tilde{C}_i = \mathrm{diag}\,(c_{i_{\sigma_i(1)}}, \ldots, c_{i_{\sigma_i(n_2)}}) =$$

for some permutation $\sigma_i \in S_{n_2}$. Note that in this scheme, it is true that if $c_{i_j} \neq 0$, either $c_{s_j} = 0$ for all $s \geq i$ or $c_{s_{\sigma_s\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}} = 0$ for all $s \geq i$. That is, c_{i_j} completes the set of nonzero summands for either one of the eigenvalues of ρ_1 or one of the eigenvalues of ρ_2.

Let

$$\rho = w_1 w_1^* + \cdots + w_k w_k^*$$

where $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \sqrt{c_{i_j}}(u_j \otimes v_{\sigma^{-1}(j)})$. From this construction, we can also deduce that if $c_{i_j}, c_{k_j} \neq 0$, then $\sigma_i(j) \neq \sigma_k(j)$. Note that for $p \neq q$,

$$w_p^* w_q = \sum_{j,\ell=1}^{n_1} \sqrt{c_{p_j} c_{q_\ell}}(u_j^* u_\ell \otimes v^*_{\sigma_p^{-1}(j)} v_{\sigma_q^{-1}(\ell)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \sqrt{c_{p_j} c_{q_j}}(v^*_{\sigma_p^{-1}(j)} v_{\sigma_q^{-1}(j)}) = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \sigma_p^{-1}(j)=\sigma_q^{-1}(j)}}^{n_1} \sqrt{c_{p_j} c_{q_j}}$$

Note that if $q > p$ and $c_{p_j} \neq 0$, then $c_{q_j} = c_{q_{\sigma_q\sigma_p^{-1}(j)}} = 0$. If $p > q$ and $c_{q_j} \neq 0$, then $c_{p_j} = c_{p_{\sigma_p\sigma_q^{-1}(j)}} = 0$. Thus $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ form an orthogonal basis. This means that $\lambda_i = ||w_i||^2 = c_{i_1} + \cdots + c_{i_{n_1}}$, (together with $n_1 n_2 - k$ more zeros) are the eigevalues of ρ.

Now, suppose $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ with spectral decomposition $s_1 x_1 x_1^* + \cdots + s_N x_N x_N^*$. Then

$$\rho_1 = s_1 \mathrm{tr}_2(x_1 x_1^*) + \cdots + s_N \mathrm{tr}_2(x_N x_N^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 = s_1 \mathrm{tr}_1(x_1 x_1^*) + \cdots + s_N \mathrm{tr}_1(x_N x_N^*)$$

Hence $\rho_1 - s_1 \mathrm{tr}_2(x_1 x_1^*)$ and $\rho_2 - s_1 \mathrm{tr}_1(x_1 x_1^*)$ are positive semidefinite. Let $c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_k$ be the nonzero eigenvalues of $s_1 \mathrm{tr}_2(x_1 x_1^*)$, which are also the nonzero eigenvalues of $s_1 \mathrm{tr}_1(x_1 x_1^*)$. Then using Lidskii's inequalities, we get $c_i \leq \min\{a_i, b_i\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Thus,

$$||\sigma||_2 = s_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \min\{a_i, b_i\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{n_1, n_2\}} \min\{a_i, b_i\} = ||\rho||_2$$

□

Appendix B. Section 3 Proofs

Note that the condition $\text{tr}_{J_i^c}(\rho) = \rho_{J_i}$ can be written as a set of linear constraint of the form $A_j x = b_j$ by vectorizing ρ into $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and ρ_{J_i} into $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$. First, we look at the projection of a given $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto the set of solutions of a linear constraint of the form $Ax = b$, where A is an $m \times n$ real matrix. For this, we need the Moore-Penrose inverse of A, denoted by A^+, which is the unique $n \times m$ matrix satisfying the following four conditions:

(a) $AA^+A = A$, (b) $A^+AA^+ = A^+$, (c) AA^+ is symmetric, (d) A^+A is symmetric.

It is known that

$$\tilde{x} = x - A^+(Ax - b) \text{ satisfies } \|x - \tilde{x}\| \leq \|x - z\| \text{ for all } z \in L = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = b\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Applying this to a linear operator $T : H_N \to H_n$ and the set $\mathcal{L} = \{\rho \in H_N : T(\rho) = \sigma\}$, we get

$$\tilde{\rho} = \rho - T^+(T(\rho) - \sigma) \text{ satisfies } ||\rho - \tilde{\rho}|| \leq ||\rho - X|| \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Here T^+ is the unique map $T^+ : H_n \to H_N$ satisfying the conditions:

(a) $TT^+T = T$,
(b) $T^+TT^+ = T^+$,
(c) $\text{tr}(TT^+(X)^*Y) = \text{tr}(X^*(TT^+(Y)))$ for all $X, Y \in H_n$,
(d) $\text{tr}(T^+T(X)^*Y) = \text{tr}(X^*(T^+T(Y)))$ for all $X, Y \in H_N$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1:
Let $T : H_{mn} \longrightarrow H_n$ such that $T(\rho) = \text{tr}_1(\rho)$ and $S : H_n \longrightarrow H_{mn}$ such that $S(\sigma) = \frac{I_m}{m} \otimes B$ for all $\sigma \in H_n$. It is clear that $TST(\rho) = T(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in H_{mn}$ and $STS(\sigma) = S(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in H_n$. Note that, TS is the identity map, and hence a hermitian operator on H_n. Finally, we show that ST is a hermitian operator as follows: let $\rho, \nu \in H_{mn}$ with block structure $\rho = (\rho_{ij})$ and $\nu = (\nu_{ij})$, where $\nu_{ij} \in M_n$.

$$(ST(\rho), \nu) = \text{tr}\left(\left(\frac{I_m}{m} \otimes \text{tr}_1(\rho)\right)\nu\right) = \text{tr}\left(\left(\frac{\text{tr}_1(\rho)\nu_{ij}}{m}\right)_{ij}\right) = \text{tr}\left(\frac{\text{tr}_1(\rho)\text{tr}_1(\nu)}{m}\right)$$

Similarly,

$$(\rho, ST(\nu)) = \text{tr}\left(\rho\left(\frac{I_m}{m} \otimes \text{tr}_1(\nu)\right)\right) = \text{tr}\left(\left(\frac{\rho_{ij}\text{tr}_1(\nu)}{m}\right)_{ij}\right) = \text{tr}\left(\frac{\text{tr}_1(\rho)\text{tr}_1(\nu)}{m}\right)$$

Thus $S = T^+$.

Now, let $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $n_J = \prod_{i \in J}^{k} n_i$ and $n_{J^c} = \prod_{i \in J^c}^{k} n_i$ and P_J be as defined in equation (19). Then for the partial trace operator $T_J : H_{n_1 \cdots n_k} \longrightarrow H_{n_J}$ such that $T_J(\rho) = \text{tr}_{J^c}(\rho) = \rho_J$, we have,

$$T_J^+(\sigma) = P\left(\frac{I_{n_{J^c}}}{n_{J^c}} \otimes \sigma\right)P^T$$

for all $\sigma \in H_{n_J}$. Therefore, the least square approximation of $Z \in H_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$ in $\mathcal{L} = \{\rho \in H_{n_1 \cdots n_k} : \text{tr}_{J^c}(\rho) = \sigma\}$ is given by

$$\Phi_J(Z) = Z - T_J^+(T_J(Z) - \sigma), = Z - P_J^T\left(\frac{I_{n_{J^c}}}{n_{J^c}} \otimes (\text{tr}_{J^c}(Z) - \sigma)\right)P_J$$

□

Given $Z \in M_{n_1 \cdots n_k}$, denote the column vector obtained by stacking the columns of Z by $\mathrm{vec}(Z)$. Then there are matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ such that

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\rho \mid A_i \mathrm{vec}(\rho) = \mathrm{vec}(\rho_{J_i}) \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m\}$$

Proposition 3.2 will follow directly from Proposition 3.1 and the following theorem.

Theorem B.1. *Let $A_i \in M_{n_i,N}$ and $b_i \in M_{n_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. For any $\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$, denote by $A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]}$ the matrix whose row space is $\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} \mathrm{Row}(A_{i_j})$. The set*

$$L = \{x \mid A_i x = b_i \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m\}$$

is nonempty if and only if for any subset $\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$, the projection of b_{i_s} onto $\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} \mathrm{Row}(A_{i_j})$ is constant for all $s = 1, \ldots r$. In this case, denote this projection by $b_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]}$. Then the least square projection of $z \in \mathbb{C}^N$ onto L is given by

$$\tilde{z} = z + \sum_{r=1}^{m} (-1)^r \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\} \subseteq \{1,\ldots,m\}} A^{+}_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]} \Big(A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]} x - b_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]} \Big)$$

Proof:
We will prove this theorem by induction.

First, we consider the case when $m = 2$. Let $V = \begin{pmatrix} V_1^T & V_2^T & V_3^T \end{pmatrix}^T$ such that the rows of V_1 form an orthonormal basis for $\mathrm{Row}(A_1) \cap \mathrm{Row}(A_2)^{\perp}$, the rows of V_2 form an orthonormal basis for $\mathrm{Row}(A_1) \cap \mathrm{Row}(A_2)$ and the rows of V_3 form an orthonormal basis for $\mathrm{Row}(A_2) \cap \mathrm{Row}(A_1)^{\perp}$. Then for some unitary $U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11} \\ U_{21} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{n_1}$ and $U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} U_{12} \\ U_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{n_2}$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix} = (U_1^* \oplus U_2^*) \begin{pmatrix} C_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_3 \end{pmatrix} V$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix}^{+} &= V^* \begin{pmatrix} C_1^{+} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2^{+}/2 & C_2^{+}/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & C_3^{+1} \end{pmatrix} (U_1 \oplus U_2) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{+} & A_2^{+} \end{pmatrix} - \tfrac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{+} P_1^{*} & A_2^{+} P_2^{*} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where $P_1 = U_1^* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} U_1$ is the projection from $\mathrm{Row}(A_1)$ to $\mathrm{Row}(A_1) \cap \mathrm{Row}(A_2)$ and $P_2 = U_2^* \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U_2$ is the projection from $\mathrm{Row}(A_2)$ to $\mathrm{Row}(A_1) \cap \mathrm{Row}(A_2)$. Note that

$$A_1^{+} P_1^{*} A_1 = V \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2^{+} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} V^* = V \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ C_2^{+} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_3 \end{pmatrix} V^* = A_2^{+} P_2^{*} A_2 := A_{[1,2]}.$$

If $L \neq \emptyset$, then there must be $\tilde{x}$ such that $A_1 \tilde{x} = b_1$ and $A_2 \tilde{x} = b_2$. Thus $A_1^{+} P_1^{*} b_1 = A_2^{+} P_1^{*} A_1 \tilde{x} = A_2^{+} P_2^{*} A_2 \tilde{x} = A_2^{+} P_2^{*} b_2 : b_{[1,2]}$. Thus, the least square approximation of a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ on the set L

is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{x} &= x - \begin{pmatrix}A_1\\A_2\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_1\\A_2\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_1\\b_2\end{pmatrix}\right)\\ &= x - A_1^+(A_1x-b_1) - A_2^+(A_2x-b_2) + \tfrac{1}{2}A_1^+P_1^*(A_1x-b_1) + \tfrac{1}{2}A_2^+P_2^*(A_2x-b_2)\\ &= x - A_1^+(A_1x-b_1) - A_2^+(A_2x-b_2) + A_{[1,2]}^+(A_{[1,2]}x-b_{[1,2]})\end{aligned}$$

This proves the theorem for the case $m = 2$.

Now, suppose it is true for $m = 2, \ldots, s-1$. The least square approximation of a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ on $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$\hat{x} = x - \begin{pmatrix}A_1\\A_2\\\vdots\\A_s\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_1\\A_2\\\vdots\\A_s\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_1\\b_2\\\vdots\\b_s\end{pmatrix}\right).$$

From the $m = 2$ case, we have

$$\hat{x} = x - \begin{pmatrix}A_1\\\vdots\\A_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_1\\\vdots\\A_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_1\\\vdots\\b_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}\right) - A_s^+(A_sx-b_s) + \begin{pmatrix}A_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\A_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\A_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\b_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}\right),$$

Apply the induction hypothesis to get

$$\begin{aligned}y_1 &= x - \begin{pmatrix}A_1\\\vdots\\A_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_1\\\vdots\\A_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_1\\\vdots\\b_{s-1}\end{pmatrix}\right)\\ &= x + \sum_{r=1}^{s-1}(-1)^r \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\subseteq\{1,\ldots,s-1\}} A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]}^+\left(A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]}x - b_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r]}\right)\\ y_2 &= x - \begin{pmatrix}A_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\A_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}^+ \left(\begin{pmatrix}A_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\A_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}x - \begin{pmatrix}b_{[1,s]}\\\vdots\\b_{[s-1,s]}\end{pmatrix}\right)\\ &= x + \sum_{r=1}^{s-1}(-1)^r \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\subseteq\{1,\ldots,s-1\}} A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r,s]}^+\left(A_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r,s]}x - b_{[i_1,\ldots,i_r,s]}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Then $\hat{x} = y_1 - y_2 + x - A_s^+(A_sx - b_s)$, which gives the desired equation. □